

A

LETTER

2.

TO THE

Reverend Dr NOWELL:

R

CONTAINING

Some REMARKS on certain ALTERA-
TIONS and ADDITIONS in the Second
Edition of his ANSWER to

PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

By the AUTHOR of PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

If DAVID be called out to meet GOLIATH, though he be
but a stripling, and the other a practised warrior from
his youth, he shall not be disheartned nor overcome.

Mr NEWTON's Sermons, p. 200.

Vide GOLIATH SLAIN, p. 172.

L O N D O N :

Printed for G. KEITH, in Gracechurch-street;

E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry;

M. FOLINSBY, near Temple-Bar;

and Mr FLETCHER, at Oxford.

MDCCLXIX.

[Price ONE SHILLING.]

LETTER

LETTER

Reverend Dr. W. O. W. E. F. L.

OMEGA TWO

[illegible]

By the _____

[illegible]

LONDON:
 Printed by J. Smith, in the Strand.
 and J. D. in the Strand.
 1845.
 and J. D. in the Strand.
 1845.

may have your own purloin. I had myself

ought to undecisive such readers as may otherwise
be misled by those insinuations and evasions for which
you are now become famous. And thus I shall

still do without prefixing my name to the piece,
as I think it a much more honorable method for

an author to conceal himself, than to place his name in a promi-

ent place, when he is desirous to be known to his

for the chief part of the work.

open with you, and thus I shall be able to

Reverend Dr. **NOWELL**.

REVEREND SIR,

IT is but very lately I heard you had put forth
a *Second Edition* of your Answer to *Pietas*,
and only a few days since I had an opportu-
nity of seeing it. Upon the first perusal of your
additions it was not my intention to have taken
any notice of them, but as you persist in casting
the most gross misrepresentations before the pub-
lic, and (I am sorry to say it) scruple not to de-
viate widely from truth where such deviations

may serve your own purpose, I find myself under the absolute necessity of adding a word or two in order to undeceive such readers as may otherwise be misled by those subtleties and evasions for which your pen is now become so famous. And this I shall still do without prefixing my name to the piece; as I think it a much more honourable method for an author to conceal himself, where the matter is really his own, than to place his name in a pompous title-page, when he is beholden to foreign aid for the chief part of his performance. To be open with you, SIR, fame reports, that notwithstanding the Answer to PIETAS is sent forth under the respectable sanction of the Public Orator of the University, in truth and reality this Public Orator has only been acting the part of *Æsop's* poor *Daw*, who you know strutted about in borrowed plumes, and fancied himself a very important creature.

I confess, however, that my chief motive for taking any notice of your *Postscript* and *Additions*, is a desire to clear up some very false assertions relative to the Principal of *Edmund Hall*, which assertions you have made with such an air of confidence, and with such smooth professions of friendship and regard towards that worthy man, whilst you are holding him forth to view in a light which by no means reflects credit on his character, that the real friendship I bear him obliges me to declare

clare the whole truth, so far as he may be concerned in it.

AND first, with regard to what you mention of the Principal having commended the candor of your book, whilst he censured the spirit in which mine was written. Whatever he may have said on this point, which you have construed in so favourable a light for yourself, I am sensible you must have misunderstood him, since he is not that sort of person who dares dissemble his real sentiments to court the favour of any man living: but this he must have done, had he affirmed, according to the letter, what you would put into his mouth. That YOUR book (if so it must still be called) was written with AN APPEARANCE of candor, is what the Principal affirmed to me; but he also told me at the very same interview, that he thought there was a most unhappy spirit of bitterness in it towards the young men, who were marked out to be the objects of your resentment; it is therefore needful, SIR, that a distinction be made between REAL CANDOR and THE APPEARANCE of it; the former is truly praiseworthy, and I wish the young men had been allowed but a single grain of it; the latter, being disguised under the worst of masks, is a most hateful monster, and may very properly be compared to the sin of those mentioned by the Psalmist, whose words are *smoother than oil*, whilst in truth they are *very swords*.

You observe, that in my Reply, " I deny that
 " Dr DIXON had the original appointment of any
 " of the Assessors." I do indeed deny it; and my
 authority comes from the Principal himself: who
 inserted that very sentence *verbatim* as it stands in
 GOLIATH SLAIN; so that I cannot think he has
 made the acknowledgment you mention.

If any credit may be given to Dr DIXON, you
 have made use of his authority to lay before the
 world a most grievous (I will only say) misrepresen-
 tation relative to Mr GROVE having preached
 on a Common. — What Dr DIXON said to you,
 SIR, on that head was this; " That there was a
 " Common near to Mr GROVE, where several dis-
 " orderly persons used to assemble on the Lord's
 " day to play at cricket, and to profane the sab-
 " bath to all bad purposes. When the church-
 " service was over, Mr GROVE desired these per-
 " sons to go into a private house upon the same
 " Common, where he remonstrated with them a-
 " bout their vicious practices, read and explained
 " part of a chapter in the Bible, and dismissed
 " them with a prayer." This is, in substance at
 least, what Dr DIXON said to you, SIR, (though
 you have from hence most injuriously declared
 that the Doctor told you Mr GROVE had preached
 on a Common :) this is what Mr GROVE did; and
 I fear not the name of an *enthusiast* if I say to
 Dr NOWELL, " Go and do thou likewise." Nay,
 I will.

I will add, that I fear not a repetition of those CANDID and POLITE expressions, of my being a *malicious slanderer*, and *under the influence of the father of lies*, if I affirm, that had Mr GROVE been an idle spectator at these *Sunday* cricket-plays, instead of shewing the tender regard he did for the souls of the players, that he would not have fallen under your censure.

Your account of Mr MIDDLETON's father being a Carpenter, and of his son being an Apprentice to him, is equally erroneous; notwithstanding the VERY GOOD AUTHORITY on which you assert it. Knowing therefore that the phrase of being "a Carpenter, or the Son of a Carpenter," is now as contemptible at *Oxford* as it was formerly in *Judea*; I beg leave to inform you, on BETTER AUTHORITY, that Mr MIDDLETON's father is a Cabinet-maker and Upholsterer; chiefly the latter; but that his Son, who was expelled, was never placed an Apprentice to the business; however, supposing he had been bound to such a trade, I hope you will not look upon this as any disparagement to him, and I am certain Mrs NOWELL will like him the better for it (a). But surely our Daw in borrowed plumes has forgotten his own extraction; and, whilst he is exposing that of others, reflects not that himself was hatched in an ignoble

A 4

ignoble

(a) Mrs NOWELL is daughter of Sir THOMAS MUNDAY, Kt. a very eminent Upholsterer in *Oxford*.

ignoble nest among the rugged mountains of *Wales*, from whence he was taken and taught the language of men. Alas! alas! what strange changes do a few years make!

As to the conversation which passed between the Principal, the Vicechancellor, and the rest of the Assessors, relative to the declaration that neither the expelled should be readmitted, nor the other members suffered to leave the hall, I have recorded it punctually from the Principal's own lips, who revised what I had written before it was committed to the press; so that I am in no fear of having at all deviated from the truth: and it lies upon the gentlemen embroiled to get out of the mud as well as they can; perhaps it may be thought that your Apology has helped them to stick a little deeper in it. However, as the Principal may think himself called upon to set this matter in its true light, I say no more about it.

As to what I have asserted concerning Mr Vice-chancellor and his Assessors having been influenced and tampered with, or, to abide by my own expression, "certain intimations of what was wished to be done having been received from a certain quarter, which much changed the face of the young mens affairs;" I assure you, SIR, that I read these words to Dr DIXON before they went to the press, and the point being a tender one, I made

made a pause before we proceeded, when I well remember that the Doctor entirely approved of their being inserted: I am therefore inclined to think you must have misunderstood him when you represent him as supposing that conscience alone, unsupported by any other bias, directed the sentence against the young men. Conscience to be sure would do great things in so good a cause, but still there are some uncharitable suspicious people in the world, who declare they have very good authority to believe that some small matter of influence did issue from a certain quarter, yea even from a Right Reverend quarter, which much changed the face of the young mens affairs, and caused it to wear a blacker aspect (b).

After you had affirmed, that "wise and good men always differed about the doctrines contained in PIETAS OXONIENSIS," in order to evade the force of my question, "*Why then must all be expelled the university who differ with you about them?*" you have in your new Edition declared, that the young men were expelled SOLELY for

(b) Whether a certain great Churchman, who refused one of the expelled gentlemen Ordination, under pretence of his having preached *irregularly*, be himself any great friend to preaching, either *regularly* or *irregularly*, is left to the determination of those who consider that this great Churchman is in possession of a very valuable Living, at which he has not been these twenty years; inasmuch that the Flock would not know they had so dignified a Shepherd, if the fleece were not annually sent to ——— at sheering-time.

for attending *illicit conventicles*. How, SIR, is this really so? why then was their holding the doctrines of *Election, Perseverance, Justification by Faith alone*, and their connection with such and such laborious parish Ministers, made particular, distinct articles of their expulsion? Have you not, by this concession, made the matter much worse than it was before? Remember, SIR, you have published to the world a long list of Articles of Expulsion: now you disavow all those Articles, except one; and confine the charge against them MERELY to the matter of *Conventicles* (c).

I am

(c) As Dr NOWELL is still harping on the string of *illicit Conventicles*, and pleads the authority of the University-statute for expelling the young men, I beg leave to present him with Mr NELSON's interpretation of those very Canons of the Church on which that statute is founded. — Mr NELSON's words, in the Preface to his *Fasts and Festivals*, are the following: "I see no reason why men may not meet and consult together to improve one another in Christian Knowledge, and by mutual advice take measures how best to further their own salvation, AS WELL AS THAT OF THEIR NEIGHBOURS; when the same liberty is taken for the improvement of Trade, and for carrying on the Pleasures and Diversions of life." — Again he says, that "As for those objections which are urged against these Societies from some Canons of the Church, they seem to be founded on a misunderstanding of the sense of those Canons, (*viz.* Canon XII. and LXXIII.) the first whereof was designed against the pernicious opinions of the Anabaptists*, and the latter only against such meetings and consultations as tended to the impeaching or depraving of the doctrines of the Church of *England*, or of the Book of Common

* It was observed in PIETAS OXONIENSIS, that these Anabaptists were very different from those we now call *Baptists*.

I am also informed by the Principal, that you have not given a very fair representation of what he said concerning the *doctrines* in dispute. It is true the Principal differs in some points from the young men, but he very ingenuously confessed to me "that he thought they had the majority of

"eminent
"mon Prayer, or any part of the Government and Discipline
"now established in the Church of *England*: neither of which
"consequences can justly be charged upon such as own and
"manifest themselves to be of the Church of *England*, and frequent the public holy exercises of the same." — He also tells us, that he cannot imagine how meetings of this sort can deserve censure, when "the liberal contributions of Gentlemen, to support a Horse-race or a Music-meeting, have never been taxed with the least illegality."

If Mr NELSON's explanation of these Canons be right, as undoubtedly it is, then the University-statute, concerning *illicit* Conventicles, which Dr NOWELL would plead against the young men, must necessarily be interpreted in the same sense; because that statute defines an *illicit* Conventicle to be such a meeting "as is prohibited by the Canons of the Church." And indeed, I think no impartial person can read that statute, without being most fully convinced that it was drawn up with all imaginable caution, lest any one should suppose, that whilst it prohibited *illicit* and *seditions* Conventicles, any restraint was meant to be laid on pious members of the established Church, which might prevent their meeting together for religious purposes. But however the natural enmity of the carnal mind would shelter itself under the notion of suppressing *illicit* Conventicles, yet that the same enmity is equally predominant against inward Religion, whether in private or in a church, was very discernible, when the reverend Mr HAWKES was curate of *Magdalen* Parish at *Oxford*, into which Church the reverend Proctors have frequently come during the time of divine service, and irreverently driven out before them all the young gowns-men who were weak enough to imagine, that they were spending a leisure hour much better in the house of God, than at the Coffeehouse or Billiard-table. *Mirabile dictu! Egomet hisce oculis vidi!*

" eminent divines of our church on their side;
 " who lived at the time of and nearest to the Re-
 " formation." And spoke in the highest terms of
 that excellent book lately published, in answer to
 your pamphlet, entitled, *The Church of Eng-
 land vindicated from the Charge of ARMINI-
 ANISM*. But what company is on the side
 of Dr NOWELL will evidently appear by the fol-
 lowing contrast, of which the one column is taken
 from the leading tenets of the Semipelagians given
 us in the accurate MACLAINE'S translation of
 MOSHEIM'S *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. p. 277.
 and from the abstracts made by ALEXANDER ROSS
 from Cardinal BELLARMINE and the council of
 Trent, in his *View of all Religions*: where he is
 pointing out in what particulars the reformed
 churches differ from that of Rome.

Semipelagians, Papists, and
Dr NOWELL,
Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

Semipelagians.

GOD does not dispense his
 grace to one more than
 another in consequence of Pre-
 destination, but is willing to save
 all men if they comply with the
 terms of his gospel. (a).

Papists.

Predestination standeth with
 man's Freewill and the true li-
 berty of his actions (b).

(a) MOSHEIM'S History, vol. I.
 p. 277. note.

(b) Jesuits Note in the Rhemish
 Testament, on Rom. ix. 8.

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,
Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

WHOM he did predestinate
 them he also called *.

God hath mercy on whom he
 will have mercy, and whom he
 will he hardeneth (a).

I am found of them that sought
 me not: (b).

All that the Father hath giv-
 en unto me shall come unto
 me (c).

No man can come unto me,
 except the Father who hath sent
 me draw him (d).

* Rom. viii. 30.

(a) Rom. ix. 18.

(b) Isa. lxx. 1.

(c) John vi. 37, 39.

(d) John vi. 44.

(c) Dr
 (d) Dr
 (e) Mo
 p. 277. no
 (f) Ro
 BELLARM

Semipelagians, Papists, and
Dr NOWELL,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

Dr NOWELL.

All those whom God the Son hath redeemed, God the Holy Ghost sanctifieth, but born only on condition of their own concurrence and compliance with the terms offered (c).

Again—Redemption is universal, but its application confined to those who comply with the terms of the gospel covenant (d).

Semipelagians.

Man being BORN a free agent, is capable of resisting the influences of grace, or complying with its suggestions (e).

Papists.

An unregenerate man hath freedom of will in matters of salvation, though not without the help of grace, so that he may hinder or further his conversion, and may by his NATURAL POWER cooperate with grace (f).

Dr NOWELL.

The ordinary grace of the Spirit gives men no new faculties: it only assists and prospers us in the use of NATURAL means, and

(c) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 108.

(d) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 111.

(e) MOSHEIM's History, vol. 1. p. 277. note.

(f) Ross's Extracts from Cardinal BELLARMINE.

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God (g).

We have no power of ourselves to help ourselves (h).

There is a remnant according to the Election of grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more of grace (i).

Forasmuch as all men are conceived and BORN in sin, &c. (b).

Behold, I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin hath my mother conceived me (j).

When we were yet WITHOUT STRENGTH, CHRIST died for the ungodly (k).

It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth (l).

They that are in the flesh cannot please God (m).

I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing (n).

Of his own will begat he us, by the word of truth (o).

(g) 2 Cor. iii. 5.

(h) Collect for the second Sunday in Lent.

(i) Rom. vii. 5.

(b) Baptismal Office.

(j) Psalm li. 5.

(k) Rom. vi. 6.

(l) Rom. ix. 16.

(m) Rom. viii. 8.

(n) Rom. vii. 18.

(o) James i. 18.

Semipelagians, Papists, and
Dr NOWELL,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

in the exercise of our NATURAL or acquired abilities (g).

Again—As God is ready to afford his grace to all who will concur with it, so it is left to man's free choice whether he will concur with it or not (h).

Again—All men have freedom of will, either to do good or evil (i).

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

God's children are born, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God (p).

Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by JESUS CHRIST, according to the good pleasure of HIS WILL (q).

THE NATURAL man discerneth not the things of the Spirit, neither CAN he know them, because they are spiritually discerned (r).

Every man is of his own nature inclined to evil (s).

"The condition of man after the fall of ADAM is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own NATURAL STRENGTH and good works to faith and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by CHRIST preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that will (u)."

O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed (v).

Semipelagians.

Man before he receives grace is capable of faith and holy desires (t).

(g) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 133.

(h) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 98.

(i) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 103.

(t) MOSHEIM's History, vol. I,

p. 277. note.

(p) John i. 13.

(q) Eph. i. 5.

(r) 1 Cor. ii. 14.

(s) Article IX.

(u) Article X.

(v) Collect for Evening Prayer.

Semipelagians, Papists, and
Dr NOWELL,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

Papists.

Election depends on works
foreseen (1).

Dr NOWELL.

The decrees of God with re-
gard to final judgment depend
on the actions of his creatures,
and the use they have made of
their freewill (m).

Again — When it is inferred
by the Fatalist that this decree
is irrelative and absolute with-
out faith and obedience foreseen,
it is a doctrine true or false su-
peradded to the article (n).

Again — You will find no proof
in scripture of any absolute Elec-
tion without any respect to mens
faith and obedience (o).

(1) Ross's Extracts from Cardinal
BELLARMINE and Council of Trent.

(m) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 116.

(n) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 104.

(o) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 105.

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,

Of PREDESTINATION and
FREEWILL.

If it be of works then it is no
more of grace (u).

For the children being not yet
born, neither having done good
or evil, that the purpose of God
according to election might stand,
not of works, but of him that
calleth, &c. (x).

God hath saved us, and call-
ed us with an holy calling; not
according to our works, but ac-
cording to his own purpose and
grace, which was given us in
CHRIST JESUS before the world
began (y).

As many as were ordained to
eternal life believed (z).

Honour and praise be given
to thee, in that it hath pleased
thy gracious goodness FREELY,
and of THINE OWN ACCORD, to
elect and choose us to salvation
before the beginning of the
world (xx).

(u) Rom. xi. 6.

(x) Rom. ix. 11.

(y) 2 Tim. i. 9.

(z) Acts xiii. 48.

(xx) Prayer at the End of the Litany
and Common Prayer Books.

Papists

Papists and Dr NOWELL,

Of PERSEVERANCE and
ASSURANCE.

THAT every particular be-
liever should be assured
infallibly that himself should be
justified, and have the gift of
perseverance, and certain know-
ledge of his predestination, is a
most damnable false illusion and
presumption, condemned by the
fathers of the holy Council of
Trent (a).

Dr NOWELL.

Perseverance must depend on
our own free choice, and there-
fore we can have no infallible
assurance of it; and the doctrine
of such assurance is a false and
dangerous delusion (b).

Again — No man can be in-
fallibly sure of his own perseve-
rance (c).

(a) Jesuits Note on the Rhemish
Testament, Rom. ix. 31.

(b) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 136.

(c) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 136.

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,

Of PERSEVERANCE and
ASSURANCE.

THE only mean and instru-
ment of salvation required
on our parts, is faith; that is to
say, A SURE TRUST AND CON-
FIDENCE in the mercies of God,
whereby we persuade ourselves,
that God both HATH and will
forgive our sins, that he HATH
accepted us again into his fa-
vour, that he HATH released us
from the bonds of damnation,
and received us again into the
number of his chosen people, not
for our merits or desert, but
only and solely for the merits of
CHRIST'S death and passion (a).

WE KNOW that we HAVE pass-
ed from death unto life (b).

The godly consideration of
Predestination and our Election
in CHRIST, is full of sweet, plea-
sant and unspeakable comfort
(c).

Draw near in FULL ASSUR-
ANCE of faith (d).

Being CONFIDENT of this very
thing, that he which hath begun
a good work in you, will per-
form it unto the day of JESUS
CHRIST (e).

Thy Spirit doth assure our
consciencethat thou art our mer-
ciful Father, and so lovest thy
children through him, that no-
thing is able to remove thy hea-

(a) Second Part of the Homily on
the Passion.

(b) 1 John iii. 14.

(c) Article XVII.

(d) Heb. x. 22.

(e) Phil. i. 6.

Papists and Dr NOWELL.

*Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,*

*Of PERSEVERANCE and
ASSURANCE.*

venly grace and favour from
us (f).

I am persuaded, that neither
death, nor life, nor angels, nor
principalities, nor powers, nor
things present, nor things to
come, nor height, nor depth,
nor any other creature, shall be
able to separate us from the love
of God which is in CHRIST Je-
sus our LORD (g).

Papists and Dr NOWELL,
Of JUSTIFICATION.

Papists.
THere is no justification by
faith alone (d).

Dr NOWELL.

Good works, though imper-
fect and worthless, are yet re-
quired by God as necessary terms,
qualifications and conditions,
both of our justification and sal-
vation (e).

Again— What do you mean
by asserting, That works are no
parts or conditions of our justifi-
cation (f) ?

Again — Ceasing to do evil,
and learning to do well, is ne-

*Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,*

Of JUSTIFICATION.

BY grace are ye saved, thro'
faith ; and that not of your-
selves, it is the gift of God ; not
of works, lest any man should
boast (b).

Therefore we conclude that a
man is justified by faith, with-
out the deeds of the law (i).

“ We are accounted righteous
“ before God, only for the me-
“ rit of our Lord and Saviour
“ JESUS CHRIST by faith, and
“ NOT for our own works or de-
“ servings. Wherefore, that we
“ are justified by faith ONLY, is

(f) Prayer at the End of most Bi-
bles and Common Prayer Books.

(g) Rom. viii. 38, 39.

(b) Eph. ii. 8.

(i) Rom. iii. 28.

(d) Ross's Extracts from BELLAR-
MINE and Council of Trent.

(e) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 124.

(f) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 124.

Papists and Dr NOWELL,
Of JUSTIFICATION.

cessary, as previous to this justification (g).

Again—God accepteth them (good works) as an observation and fulfilling of his law, and they be MERITORIOUS towards the attaining of everlasting life. Second Edit. p. 82.

(g) Dr NOWELL's Answer, p. 123.

Scripture and Church of
ENGLAND,
Of JUSTIFICATION.

" a most wholsome doctrine, and
" very full of comfort, &c. (k).

" Without works, by faith only, freely we receive remission
" of our sins (l)."

" Good works are the fruits
" of faith, and follow after justification (m).

" Works done before the grace
" of CHRIST, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, but have in them
" the nature of sin (n)."

" This doctrine" (of justification by faith alone, without works,) " whosoever denieth, is
" not to be counted for a christian man (o)."

(k) Article XI.

(l) Homily of Salvation, Part II.

(m) Article XII.

(n) Article XIII. intituled, Of Works before Justification.

(o) Homily of Salvation, Part II.

BEHOLD now, SIR, behold and blush to see from what a sink your doctrines are drained, and instead of bolstering up your cause any longer by having recourse to a LAUD (a), GARDINER and

BONNER,

(a) Although Dr NOWELL has not particularly quoted the works of LAUD, yet he stands foremost in his list of bright ornaments in Divinity. And his inclination to Popery was so very visible, that a court Lady, daughter to the Earl of Devonshire, having turned Papist, being asked by Archbishop LAUD the reason, " It is chiefly, said she, because I hate to travel in

" 2

BONNER, whose works you have so largely quoted, confess (and if you do it not in words your silence will be construed as such a confession) that the ingenious Author of *The Church of England vindicated from the charge of ARMINIANISM*, has fairly wrested all your weapons out of your hands, exposed your horrible perversions, and totally overthrown the mighty *Babel* that you and your friends by united efforts were so long in building.

And now, SIR, for a word or two relative to our friend Mr W——N, the Infidel:

You

“ a crowd ; ” the meaning of which expression being desired, she replied, “ I perceive your Grace and many others are making haste to *Rome*, and therefore to prevent being crowded “ I am gone before you. ” But in nothing did LAUD’s popish superstition appear more flagrant than in his manner of consecrating *St Catherine’s* church ; which ceremony began by a loud voice within, singing, “ Lift up your heads, O ye gates ; “ and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may come in. ” Upon which, in came LAUD ; who falling upon his knees, with arms expanded, cried out, “ This place is holy, I pronounce it holy, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost. ” Then taking some dust from the floor, and throwing it into the air, he and his train marched twice or thrice round the church, repeating certain psalms as they went in procession. After which the Archbishop poured out several blessings and curses, almost in the same breath ; and administered the Sacrament with divers antic gestures, bowing frequently to the bread and wine, starting back at the sight of the elements, and dropping the napkin in which the bread was contained. The ceremony being finished, his Grace returned home, no doubt, fully persuaded that the church had received some wonderful efficacy from what had been done.

You affirm (p. 190:) in answer to my eighth Query, that no charge had been brought against Mr W——N, when he was called in evidence; and that Doctor DIXON himself, at that time, had no objection to his character. You then refer me to another part of your book, where you even say that Mr W——N's character was fair and unsuspected when he gave his evidence.

Really, SIR, after such an assertion as this, I can never wonder at any thing you advance to patch up your cause. — Is it possible, SIR, that you can forget that at the very time when Mr W——N gave his evidence against Mr KAY, that Gentleman declared Mr W——N's principles before the whole Court; and urged his disbelief of the Scriptures, as sufficient cause why his testimony should not be admitted; especially, as the testimony he gave related only to some abstruse points of faith? Is it possible, SIR, you should forget that you yourself observed, at the same time, “that what Mr W——N was accused of, was much worse than any of the charges against the young men?” Were not then Mr W——N's character and principles sufficiently known to Mr Vicechancellor and his Assessors at the time of trial? Yes, SIR, they were known, well-known, and you yourself expressed a very proper abhorrence of them at that time. But of
the

the two evils, namely, Infidelity and Methodism, you might perhaps think you had chosen the least; and therefore, notwithstanding what Mr KAY had objected against Mr W——N's testimony, and notwithstanding he appealed to two impartial witnesses, in confirmation of his objections; I say, notwithstanding this, W——N's evidence was actually admitted; and by comparing the articles of expulsion, with the minutes taken by you against Mr KAY, we find that Mr Vicechancellor and his Assessors, are unanimous in calling this infidel's evidence, SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE!

It is therefore an undeniable fact, that Mr W——N's character was at least suspected and impeached, when the young men were tried; and if so, why was not the sentence against Mr KAY, which depended so entirely upon W——N's testimony, at least respited, till the character of his accuser should be cleared from the black charges of Blasphemy and Infidelity? I need not tell you, SIR, that a felon's appeal on a like occasion, would not have been rejected; and the worst of criminals are suffered to challenge even their jurymen, whom they may suspect of partiality, or of being tainted with corrupt principles: — But the friendless Mr KAY, must not be allowed so much as even the murderer's privilege; for before Mr WRIGHT and Mr BROWNE are suffered to prove Mr W——N's infidelity, Mr KAY is expelled
 B 3 upon

upon his testimony. The day after the expulsion, namely, March 12, 1768. Messrs. BROWNE and WRIGHT appear before the Vicechancellor, and notwithstanding they shew all possible tenderness to Mr W——N, yet they both confirm on oath Mr KAY's allegations against him. — Mr V——C——r lays the affidavits before some Heads of Houses, WHO WERE OF OPINION THEY DID NOT CONTAIN SUFFICIENT MATTER FOR A PUBLIC CITATION; but advised, that the party accused, who was gone into the country, should, on his return to the University, be summoned before them, to GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF HIS PRINCIPLES; [that is, in other words, to let the criminal's own testimony, in favour of himself, prove whether he be a criminal or not.] Mr W——N returns to College, waits on Mr Vicechancellor, shews him a letter from Mr Higson, wherein that Gentleman mentions his good will to give him a Testimonium for holy Orders, provided he was assured by the Vicechancellor that Mr W——N had given satisfaction to the University in respect to the charge of Infidelity. — Mr W——N assures Mr V——C——r, that he is a very sound Orthodox Believer. Mr V——C——r tells him, he must appear next day before the Heads of Houses. The Heads assemble; Mr W——N appears, and being called in, and STRICTLY EXAMINED, assures them all together, that he is really and truly a very good christian. A recantation is made by this
good

good christian; which recantation, though now polished and vamped up for public inspection, with all the specious arts of a public Orator, contains the following matter :

“ I J—N. W——N have indeed disparaged the
 “ truth of Revelation, particularly the miracles
 “ of MOSES. However, I was very drunk at a
 “ Gaudy, in honour of the temperate JOHN BAP-
 “ TIST, when I did it; and now [as I have ap-
 “ plied for my Testimonium for Orders] I hum-
 “ bly hope your Headships will credit me, when
 “ I tell you, I firmly believe all the Bible, from
 “ the first chapter of *Genesis* to the end of *Reve-*
 “ *lation*; and am also very sorry for my criminal
 “ excess. And however I may at other times
 “ have blasphemed the holy Scriptures, I do
 “ assure you, that all such unguarded expressions
 “ were the effect of mere hypocrisy, and not de-
 “ clarative of my real principles, which now are,
 “ ever have been, and I trust ever will continue,
 “ diametrically opposite to Scepticism and Infir-
 “ delity, which from my heart I detest and
 “ abhor. So that all the while I was blasphem-
 “ ing JESUS CHRIST with my tongue, you cannot
 “ conceive how highly I honoured him in my
 “ heart; as witness my hand,

“ J——N W——N.”

To compleat the farte, Mr W——N, though already proved to have reviled the holy Scriptures, by the depositions of two Gowns-men before Mr Vicechancellor, is now required to put his own hand upon the same holy Scriptures; and called upon, by the solemn Regard he pays to that inspired word, to swear to the truth of his recantation, that he believes every tittle of the Bible, and likewise that he is very sorry for having been intoxicated with liquor at St John's Gaudy. All this Mr W——N very readily deposeth.

*Sworn before me,
the ninth day of May, 1768.*

D. DURELL, Vicechancellor.

We whose names are underwritten do certify, that JOHN W——N read the above declaration publicly in congregation, this tenth day of May, 1768.

D. DURELL, Vicechancellor,
B. WHEELER, Senior Proctor,
E. WHITMORE, Junior Proctor.

TELL me now, ye learned in the law! did ye ever before know an instance of an oath being administred to a criminal, in order to prove his own innocence, especially when he had been before convicted by the depositions of two credible witnesses, and had even confessed his guilt?

Tell

Tell me, ye learned in the law! did you ever know an instance of one who had been convicted of Blasphemy being put to his oath at all? Why does any man, when he is sworn, put his right hand upon the sacred word of the most high God, but in token of his deep reverence for that word; but if I utterly reject the testimony therein contained, it is not a farthing matter whether I put my hand on the gospel, or on Bishop WARBURTON's book *upon the operations of the Holy Ghost*.

Well, Mr W——N, however, swears himself to be a very good Christian. He is believed. His Testimonium is given; and in a few days he is Ordained a Minister of JESUS CHRIST. — *Totus mundus agit histrionem.*

Should it be asked from whence I received all this intelligence? I answer, from Doctor NOWELL's own book; to which I now appeal; and send every judicious reader to examine, whether every syllable I have asserted, be not either affirmed, or implied, in the Doctor's representation of the matter.

BUT here it will be necessary to make a few animadversions relative to your saying, that *the Vicechancellor was not consulted, neither was his advice*

vice ever asked, in relation to the Testimonium given to Mr W——N, the drunken Infidel.

And here I must take the liberty of proving my point, and of shewing, that the Vicechancellor actually *was* consulted in relation to this Testimonium, by bringing a quotation from another part of your own book, and setting it in a contrast with what you have advanced in your Second Edition; when it will lie at your door to clear up the two opposite assertions which you have made.

You tell us (p. 63. 2^d edit.) that “Mr W——N. waited on the Vicechancellor on the eighth of May, and shewed him a letter from Mr Higson, in answer to an application he made for Testimonials for holy Orders, wherein Mr Higson declared, that he had no objection to signing such Testimonials, provided he was assured by the Vicechancellor, that he had given satisfaction to the University in respect to the charge of Infidelity, which had been brought against him.”

Now from hence it is most plainly deducible, that no Testimonials were to be signed by Mr Higson, for this same Mr W——N, till Mr Vicechancellor had assured Mr Higson that he was perfectly satisfied in regard to the charge of Infidelity,

delity, exhibited against the said W—N. But the Testimonials actually were signed by Mr HIGSON. *Ergo*, by all the rules of logic (supposing Mr HIGSON to have acted consistently with his own declaration) Mr Vicechancellor was not only consulted, but must actually have testified his approbation of Mr W—N's character and principles. Please to review my reasoning; and if it be not found I will readily ask your pardon, Mr Vicechancellor's, and Mr HIGSON's.

I am assured by the Principal of *Edmund Hall*, that much umbrage was given at his permitting Mr KAY to continue at that Hall a short time after his expulsion; however that the Principal had no other motive than that of humanity in giving such countenance to Mr KAY, will evidently appear from the consideration of a few circumstances relative to Mr KAY's case, which is perhaps the most worthy of compassion of any among the expelled members.

This young gentleman, against whom no charge was exhibited but having heard a Staymaker pray, and having believed doctrines which Dr NOWELL affirms wise and good men have always differed about (*b*), was never designed for any other calling

(*b*) The doctrines which Mr KAY was expelled for believing, are exactly the same which BARNET and BAROE, whilst the Reformation doctrines were held in their purity, were censured

ing than that of the Ministry; was regularly educated at a public school, had made great proficiency in his studies, and was humble and exemplary in his life and conversation; but by the late arbitrary act of power, he is not only cut out of his exhibition, &c. but thrown upon his parents in their advanced years, who, though they are very reputable people, are by no means in affluent circumstances, their great affection for a dutiful child having caused them to drain themselves that they might give him a good education, in hopes of his getting into the ministry. This is literally the true state of the case with regard to Mr KAY, and yet Dr NOWELL very modestly affirms, that all the young men met with the greatest kindness and humanity that could possibly be shewn to them. However, I hope this will plead the Principal's excuse for any acts of favour conferred on Mr KAY in his distress.

And here, SIR, permit me to say in answer to your sneer relative to Mr W——*n having lived with*

sured for denying: so that the very same doctrines which were received as orthodox at one University, in the reign of ELIZABETH, are cast out as heterodox from another University, in the reign of GEORGE the third. And in the former of these reigns we have a very striking example of a complaint made to the Chancellor of *Cambridge*, against certain members of that University, for rejecting those very doctrines which, in the latter reign, the University of *Oxford* complain to their Chancellor against certain members for believing.—But to shew the power of prejudice, whilst Dr NOWELL esteems the proceedings against BARRET a violent instance of persecution, he calls the expulsion of the young men *a commendable act of discipline*.

with a Clergyman who is called a Methodist, from whence you take occasion to observe, "that the
 "folly of Methodism naturally leads to madness
 "or infidelity;" that had Mr W——N, whilst he was in the house of the Rev. Mr G——N, really imbibed the principles of Methodism, and not those which he had previously imbibed to the great concern of that worthy Clergyman, I say had Mr W——N truly imbibed the faith and practice of what is called Methodism, instead of Infidelity and Licentiousness, it is but too apparent that his Testimonium for Orders would soon have been exchanged for Articles of Expulsion.

I must now pay a particular attention to the challenge you introduce with, so much solemnity, desiring me to clear up what I have advanced concerning the salvation of all infants.

I had observed (in PIET. OXON.) that, "of all
 "others, the doctrines which deny fallen man's
 "free-will to good, and which maintain an ABSOLUTE ELECTION of some, in preference to
 "others (even before the children are born, or
 "have done good or evil;) are most hateful to
 "the natural pride of our hearts." This you call (p. 138. 2^d edit.) MY *definition of predestination*: whereas, in this paragraph, there is no *definition* at all. I define neither the *word* Predestination, nor the *thing*: but only assert, that the scripture doctrines

doctrines of man's natural impotence, and of God's absolute choice of some to everlasting life, are truths which human pride cannot easily digest. — "Predestination," you add, as believed by me, "having no respect to sin, must necessarily include infants, as well as adults." I answer, 1st, Though neither sin nor holiness be a cause of predestination, which is an immanent act of the divine will, and therefore can be occasioned by nothing *ab extra*, or out of God; yet both good and evil do, *consequently*, fall under his decrees; and are directed to those ends which his wisdom and will ordained should be answered by them. 2^{dly}, *Predestination*, upon my principles, does, indeed, extend to those who die in infancy; every one of whom I believe to have been predestinated to life. I have, therefore, a right to call your empty flourish, concerning the imaginary reprobation of infants, "an *unjust* accusation, and an inference which I abhor." Nor is the everlasting death of some infants, "a necessary consequence, drawn from my own definition." I give it as my opinion, that they are all predestinated to life: from whence, says Dr NOWELL, it necessarily follows, that many of them shall be damned. But your consequence will never follow, till salvation and condemnation are terms synonymous.

You go on (*ibid.*) "Can you assign any other reason why ALL infants, whether baptized or
" unbaptized,

“ unbaptized, shall be saved, than that the redemption purchased by CHRIST was universal, “ and ALL, who do not commit actual sin, are “ made partakers of it? ” I might well enough be excused from taking any notice of this query. It is so excessively confused and embarrassed, that, till *explained* by the public Orator, the drift of it seems almost incomprehensible by his readers. However, I will gather up the meaning, as well as I can ; but must recommend it to you, on all future occasions, to express yourself with at least *some* degree of precision and perspicuity.

1. I can assign only the same reason for the salvation of departed infants, which the scriptures assign for that of elect adult, namely, because it is not the *WILL of our heavenly Father that one of them should perish.*

2. CHRIST's redemption of these infants, and their subsequent salvation, do not prove his redemption to be absolutely unlimited with regard to *adult* persons. CHRIST might shed his blood (and I believe he did) universally for all who should die in infancy ; and yet not universally for all who should live to years of maturity.

3. I know not what you mean by a “ *purchased redemption.* ” You might as well talk of a *saved salvation* ; or an *atoned atonement.* Not *redemption*, but the *persons redeemed*, were the objects of CHRIST's purchase.

Upon

Upon the whole, there is not the least inconsistency, real or seeming, between my doctrine of AN ABSOLUTE CHOICE OF SOME, IN PREFERENCE TO OTHERS, EVEN BEFORE THE CHILDREN ARE BORN, OR HAVE DONE GOOD OR EVIL, and what you call my notions concerning the SALVATION OF ALL CHILDREN. The two doctrines harmonise and tally, with as much exactness as did the stones of Solomon's temple; and comport no less with the rubric of our own church, which declares it to be "certain from God's word, that children, who "die baptized, are undoubtedly saved." I only go on, where the church leaves off; and suppose, that *unbaptized* infants have likewise a share in the common salvation.

But what astonishes me almost beyond any thing in your book, is the attempt you have made to accuse me of forgery, or otherwise of pirating what you call the forgery of NEAL, and shamefully perverting Archbishop WHITGIFT's meaning, when I said that this Archbishop, in his letter to the University, affirmed "that they (the *Lambeth* Articles) are not to be looked upon as new laws and decrees, but only as an explication of "certain points, apprehended to be true, and "correspondent to the doctrine professed in the "Church of *England*, and already established by "the laws of the land." These are the words of my supposed forgery. — Let us now see what are the

the words of WHITGIFT's letter alluded to, and by comparing them with my own, we shall come to an exact knowledge of this *mighty forgery*, this *shameful perversion*. — WHITGIFT expresses himself verbatim as follows, “ thinking them (the “ *Lambeth Articles*) to be true, and correspondent to the doctrine professed in the church of “ *England*, and established by the laws of the “ land.”

Let me now appeal to every reader, yea to those who are most prejudiced against me, whether it were possible in an abridgment of WHITGIFT's letter, to have given a more faithful account of it, when not only the substance, but even the words of it are so nearly abided by? But when people are so put to their shifts that they have nothing to say, we must not wonder that they often advance what they had better have kept to themselves. However I am willing to believe in your excuse, that instead of reading STRYPE yourself, you received your instructions at second hand; but before you accuse any person of *forgery* and *perversion* for the future, I advise you as a friend to have some proof of the charge: and shall only add, that when a Protestant Divine is not ashamed to quote and defend the *Pia & Catholica institutio*, (a book which BURNET tells us the Papists rejoiced at the publication of; and STRYPE, that some of the reformed were censured for preaching against) and even from thence to affirm in express

C

words

words the MERITORIOUSNESS of good works, (*vide* p. 18.) we are not to be astonished at any thing which may issue from such a pen.

THOUGH the force of most of my queries is perhaps greatly strengthened by the quibbling answers you have made to them, yet I must beg leave to take particular notice of one or two of those answers.

You say “ that you do not know whether Mr “ HIGSON ever laboured under an insanity of “ mind or not; but this you know, that at the “ time of the visitation he was in his perfect “ senses, and that Dr DIXON has since the expulsion bore testimony to his worth and excellence.”

Now as I never affirmed any thing relative to Mr HIGSON but what I received from Dr DIXON’s own mouth, I shall only say that I am again inclined to believe you must greatly have mistaken the Doctor, when you imagined that he launched forth into such high encomiums upon that Gentleman’s worth and excellence, either as a Tutor or in any other character. — And since you are pleased to insinuate that I have represented Mr HIGSON’s religious qualm as a state of insanity, (though I cannot admit your reasoning) yet if we are to judge of Mr HIGSON’s sanity or insanity of mind by the length or frequency of such qualms, I will not deny but he has for some time past been quite COMPOS MENTIS.

In

In reply to another of my queries you are pleased to say that a school-boy would have deserved correction for such an examination as Mr MIDDLETON passed; but how agrees this with the commendations given by the Court to that Gentleman on account of that very examination?

AS to the small error, if an error it may be called, in the first edition of PIETAS OXONIENSIS, concerning the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, it was fully rectified in the second impression of that pamphlet, before your work was published. But why his Grace should have been offended (as you say he was) at the mention which had been made of him in the first Edition, I am at a loss to discover, since that mention was, I hope, both respectful and honourable: And indeed I am very well informed that he himself did acknowledge it to be so, and only added, that the Author of PIETAS had been under some mistake relative to his having been educated in the profession of a Manmidwife, whereas he only attended one course of lectures in Midwifry at *Paris*. — In every other respect my account of him was perfectly exact, and even in this point, which you censure as erroneous, I followed the generally received opinion concerning him.

A much great error however have you fallen into by your sarcastic sneer against the loyalty of
 c 2 the

the famous Mr PRYNNE. For whatever that Gentleman's principles about church-government might be, his life was exemplary, and his loyalty unquestionable.—“He made a long speech in the House concerning the satisfactoriness of the King's answers to the Propositions of Peace, and but two days after, was refused admittance by the army. — On account of his great opposition to CROMWELL, he was, on the first of July 1650, committed close prisoner to *Dunster* Castle. He thereupon insisted strongly upon the liberty of the subject, which, though now of no great weight with CROMWELL, seems to have set him free.— In 1659 Mr PRYNNE, as a secluded member of the House, being restored to sit again, became instrumental in recalling King CHARLES the Second, in which he shewed great zeal: and after the Restoration, was made chief keeper of his Majesty's Records in the Tower, with a salary of 500*l.* per annum (a).”

I cannot conclude this piece without offering a word of excuse for the haste and inconnection that are so visible in it. But as I observed at the beginning, so I again repeat, that it is but very lately that I even heard of your second Edition, (which I now find was put forth though a large number of the first remain unfold). A like apology ought to be made for *GOLIATH SLAIN*, part of which was obliged to be printed
off

(a) Brit. Biog. Life of LAUD, p. 273.

off without my seeing the proofs; but as it is not elegance but truth which ought principally to guide the pen, I humbly hope Dr NOWELL and I shall ever be ready to draw a line of candor over each others blunders (a). I promise however in case of a new edition of GOLIATH to send it abroad in a more accurate dress, though the great number that I printed (*viz.* two thousand) makes me think that another impression will hardly be called for, unless any of the four OXONIAN Heads, who expelled the young men, should choose to buy a cargo to give away, for which charitable purpose they shall have a good allowance made them, and if the keepers of the *Bodleian* and *Ratcliffe* Libraries will apply to Mr DILLY, Bookseller in the *Poultry*, they shall receive *gratis* two handsome copies of PIETAS and GOLIATH to be deposited in their respective libraries PRO BONO PUBLICO UNIVERSITATIS.

I am,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

The Author of PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

(a) The reader is desired to take notice, that the difficulty which occurred in GOLIATH SLAIN, p. 129, &c. about the names of the English Divines sent to the Synod of *Dort*, was owing to a mistake relative to Dr CARLETON, who was not at that time Bishop of *Chichester*, but of *Landaff*, and used to sign his name GEO. LANDAVEN. which was contracted for GEORGIUS LANDAVENSIS, and caused me, partly through haste and partly through inattention to the frequent manner of signature by Bishops, to put the name of the Bishoprick for the name of the Bishop, an error which I confess I was not aware of till it was too late to be rectified.

P O S T S C R I P T.

THOUGH I had determined to say no more about doctrinal points, yet since the chief part of this piece was finished, the declaration of King JAMES the First against VORSTIUS, with his Letter to the States, dated *October 6, 1611.* having fallen into my hands, I cannot help extracting the following remarkable words from the said declaration and letter :

“ What need we make any question of the arrogancy of these Heretics, or rather atheistical Sectaries among you ; when one of them at this present remaining in your town of *Leyden*, (namely, BERTIUS, a Scholar of ARMINIUS) hath not only presumed to publish a blasphemous book, of the apostacy of the saints, (the very title whereof were enough to make it worthy the fire) but hath besides been so impudent, as to send a copy thereof to our Archbishop of *Canterbury* ; together with a letter, wherein he is not ashamed to lie so grossly, as to avow that his heresies contained in the said book are agreeable to the religion and profession of the Church of *England*.”

In

In the same Letter his Majesty affirms, " that
 " all the Reformed Churches of *Germany*, had
 " complained with open mouth against ARMINI-
 " US: and that for his own part, being honoured
 " with the title of DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, if
 " they suffered such pestilent heretics to NESTLE
 " AMONG THEM, and did not suppress those an-
 " cient heresies, which, though long since con-
 " demned by the catholic church, were now
 " brought back from hell, he should not only be
 " obliged to break all union with such false he-
 " retical Churches, but would exhort all other
 " Reformed Churches to join with him in extin-
 " guishing, and remanding back to hell, those
 " abominable heresies; and would also strictly
 " prohibit the youth of his dominions, from re-
 " paring to SO INFECTED A PLACE as the UNIVER-
 " SITY OF LEYDEN."

These are his Majesty's own words, from which
 the following inferences are deducible.

I. If that Monarch personally interfered with the
 States, to prevent their choosing VORSTIUS Divi-
 nity Professor in the University of *Leyden*, because
 he held the doctrine of the Saints Apostacy; he
 would indubitably have deemed any person
 equally improper to have been a Vicechancellor,
 a Lady *Margaret's* Professor of Divinity, a Pub-
 lic

lic Orator, or a Senior Proctor in the University of *Oxford*, who held the same doctrine.

II. If the King was so highly displeased at BERTIUS, though a foreigner, and residing in *Holland*, for IMPUDENTLY sending a book and a letter to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, wherein he maintains *the apostacy of the saints*; and that *he who is once a child of God, is NOT ALWAYS a child of God*; great, indeed, would have been his indignation and astonishment, if, within his own dominions, and in one of his own Universities, four reverend and dignified Divines could have been found, who even dared to draw the sword of persecution, and to expel from their borders, such as maintained, with his Majesty, *the Perseverance of the Saints, and that he who is once a child of God, IS ALWAYS a child of God*.— But how much greater still would have been his surprize, if even a Vicechancellor, a Divinity Professor, a Public Orator, and a Senior Proctor, should all, or any of them, have sent a letter to the then Archbishop of *Canterbury*, wherein one of the grand complaints against any member of the University was, his not being of one mind with VORSTIUS and BERTIUS, against whom the King employed his pen; or (still to keep close to Doctor NOWELL's own words, in the articles of expulsion) that such member held, “once a child of God, always a “child of God?” Yet a similar letter and complaint,

plaint, were actually, as I am well informed, sent from *Oxford* to the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

III. If his Majesty declared it his royal pleasure to prohibit the youth of his dominions from repairing to SO INFECTED A PLACE AS THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN, on account of the pestilent heretics which were suffered to NESTLE THERE; then certainly he could have given no patronage to ANY University from which such as adhered to his Majesty, and dissented from ARMINIUS, were ignominiously banished, and in which NONE WERE SUFFERED TO NESTLE, but those who are INFECTED with the very same principles which he, as Defender of the Faith, declares it his duty to extirpate.

NOW I would not be understood to justify the violence of his Majesty's expressions; but this is certain, that if it were part of JAMES's royal prerogative to be the Defender of that Faith (against ARMINIUS) for which Mr KAY (c) was expelled,

(c) I have before observed that the only accusations on which Mr KAY was proceeded against and expelled were, his believing Doctrines which our Public Orator himself confesseth to have been believed by the wisest and best of men, and having heard a Staymaker pray. And if that mirror of piety and learning Archbishop LEIGHTON, had been at the University, it is probable he would have been just in the same predicament,
for

expelled, namely, "Once a child of God, always a child of God;" then his present Majesty must be also a Defender of the same Faith, the standard of orthodoxy, namely, the XXXIX Articles of the Church, being the same now as they have ever been since the Reformation. And if his present Majesty be a Defender of this Faith, then certainly none of his divines ought to be subverters of it.—All we can say is,

Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis.

But thus it is. — The very same Articles, are, in our day, made the test of admission into the Church, to those who believe, and to those who deny Election; to those who believe, and to those who deny Perseverance; to those who

for he not only held all the Doctrines which Mr KAY was expelled for holding; but on the subject of prayer thus expresses himself: "Many poor unlettered christians far outstrip your School Rabbies in this faculty; because *it is not effectually taught in these lower academies*; they must be in God's own school, children of his house, that speak this language." The good Archbishop is here plainly speaking of extempore prayer. But I will also produce an instance of a mechanic being constantly employed to read the church service in the desk; and this is in the Gaol chapel at *Shrewsbury*; for which the county has for a long while paid five pounds a year to a Shoemaker. Let it be observed that I do not mention this circumstance with approbation, but in hopes some generous Divine of the place will at length undertake the office, without any other wages than the pleasure of being employed in so good a work.

who believe, and to those who deny Free-will ; to those who believe Justification by faith alone, and to those who believe Justification by works ; to those who believe man to be a fallen creature, and to those who believe him to be born as pure as ADAM came out of the hands of his Creator ; to those who hold the equality of the Three Persons in the Godhead, and to those who are professed Arians ; to *those who deny the miracles of MOSES*, and SOMETIMES to those who believe them. — To sum up the whole state of the case in few words : Because of Swearing and subscribing to Articles — because of Infidelity — because of Drunkenness — because of EXPELLING, — the land mourneth.

N. B. THIS piece having been intirely finished before the following extract of a Letter from the Reverend Mr NEWTON to the Earl of DARTMOUTH was conveyed to me, I am under a necessity of inserting that extract in this place, and sincerely hope it will be a means of convincing every impartial reader of the uprightness of Mr NEWTON's intention in writing to Dr NOWELL, as also that the Doctor has most shamefully perverted Mr NEWTON's meaning, in drawing from his Letter the injurious conclusions which he has done, by saying that " he supposes Mr NEWTON means " to disclaim all connections with that set of men, " (Methodists) and expresses his concern for having been mentioned on this occasion."

Mr

Mr NEWTON's words are as follow :

My LORD,

“ I Do not repent my having written to Dr
 “ NOWELL, so far as I may be allowed to
 “ explain my own meaning, but the Doctor has
 “ brought me into a difficulty. In his second
 “ Edition he has not only published an extract
 “ of my letter to him, but put this unnecessary
 “ preface to it.” “ *By which I suppose he means*
 “ *to disclaim all connections with that set of men.*”
 “ If the Doctor really meant to do me a kindness
 “ by this supposition, I ought not to be angry
 “ with him, though I must own I suspect some-
 “ thing else. However what he supposes is so
 “ contrary to the feelings of my heart, so injuri-
 “ ous to my own character, and so likely to
 “ grieve many whom I love and honor, that I
 “ know not how in conscience to let it pass with-
 “ out saying or doing something that may shew
 “ him, he is mistaken. For if I do not notice
 “ it, I may well expect it will be taken for granted
 “ that I courted Dr NOWELL to screen me from
 “ the imputation of Methodism. The only thing
 “ I wanted set right was the single fact about
 “ Mr MATHEWS; and with regard to him, I
 “ had no thought of disclaiming any thing but
 “ his tuition. I said I had never seen him but
 “ once, because it had so happened, but I was
 “ neither

“ neither ashamed nor unwilling to have seen
 “ him oftener, if he had thought proper to have
 “ called. That I was *surprised* and *concerned* my
 “ name should have been mentioned at *Oxford*,
 “ may sound strange to some; but as to *surprise*,
 “ I might indeed have said *I was not surprised* in
 “ another sense, for I knew such things must be
 “ expected; but as I had no call or intention to
 “ interfere in a dispute, which needed none of
 “ my help, I chose to write in terms of respect:
 “ and therefore speaking after the manner of
 “ men, I intimated my surprise, that a person
 “ could not go on quietly in his own parish,
 “ without being marked out by the University
 “ of *Oxford* as a Methodist. As to the word
 “ *concerned*, I wished afterwards I had omitted
 “ it when writing to Dr NOWELL; but I hope
 “ those who know me will not think I was a-
 “ shamed or sorry to be thought engaged in that
 “ cause which some call Methodism, or that I was
 “ strictly unwilling to be named with Messieurs
 “ VENN, FLETCHER, TOWNSEND or DAVIES, &c.
 “ but I have been fond of that maxim, *bene vixit*,
 “ *qui bene latuit*. I could be content and desirous
 “ to have my little name confined within the
 “ circle of my connections and friends, and so
 “ far I was *concerned* to see myself marked out
 “ as a person of more consequence than I really
 “ am, &c. &c.”

[24]
Lately Published

PIETAS OXONIENSIS: or, a full and impartial Account of the Expulsion of Six Students from St *Edmund Hall, Oxford*. With a Dedication to the Right Honourable the Earl of LITCHFIELD, Chancellor of that University. By a Master of Arts of that University. Price 1s.

A DEFENCE of the Doctrines of Sovereign GRACE: being a full Answer to a Letter lately addressed to the Author of **PIETAS OXONIENSIS** By the Author of that Book. Price 6d.

GOLIATH SLAIN: being a Reply to the Rev. Dr NOWELL's Answer to **PIETAS OXONIENSIS**. With a Dedication to every particular Member of the University. By the Author of **PIETAS OXONIENSIS**. Price 2s. 6d.

Sold by G. KEITH, in Gracechurch-street;
E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry;
M. FOLINSBY, near Temple-Bar;
and Mr FLETCHER, at Oxford.



2 1 7 1 7